



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,715	10/27/2003	Jussi Maaniitty	944-001.120	5201
10945 7590 01/19/2011 NOKIA CORPORATION c/o Ware, Fressola, Van Der Stuys & Adolphson LLP Building Five, Bradford Green 755 Main Street, PO Box 224 Monroe, CT 06468				
EXAMINER				
PITARO, RYAN F				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/19/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,715

Applicant(s)

MAANITTY ET AL.

Examiner

RYAN F. PITARO

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8-12 and 14-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,7,13 and 18-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This action is in response to the Amendment filed 12/28/2010. This action is Non-Final.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/128/2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.


Claims 1-2,4-6,8-12,14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alvesalo ("Alvesalo", US 2003/0222899) in view of Pavley et al ("Pavley",US 7,337,403).

As per claim 1, Alvesalo teaches a method, comprising:

assembling in a handheld telecommunication terminal a plurality of image objects of a slide in a first column, the plurality of image objects forming a part of the slide that change and are to be displayed sequentially one after the other when a multimedia presentation is played on the handheld telecommunication terminal having a display device [0025]-[0026], and

also assembling in the handheld telecommunication terminal any and all objects of the slide in a second column, the any and all objects forming part of the slide that remain static and are to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the plurality of objects of the first column when the multimedia presentation is played ([0021] parallel and [0025]-[0026]); and

displaying at the same time the first and second column side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the multimedia presentation is played, for editing by a user [0025]-[0026].



Alvesalo fails to distinctly point out teaching presenting the user with a dialog box in which the user is able to provide a duration that the plurality of objects is to be displayed. However, Pavley teaches the method further comprising presenting the user with a dialog box in which the user is able to provide a duration that the plurality of image objects of the slide that change is to be displayed (Figure 21, Column 16 lines 20-33, The second property the user may change is the duration the media object will be played back before the next media object is played).

48




FIG. 21

Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Pavley with the method of Alvesalo. Motivation to do so would have been to apply a known technique in order to give the user more control over the customization the presentation which would have yielded predictable results.

As per claim 2, Alvesalo-Pavley teaches a method as in claim 1, wherein the multimedia presentation is for communication as a multimedia message service message (Alvesalo, [0004]).

Claim 4 is similar in scope to that of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.


Claims 5 and 11 are similar in scope to that of claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 6 is similar in scope to that of claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 8 is similar in scope to that of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 9, Avesalo-Pavley teaches a method as in claim 1, wherein the second column includes only one object, which is to be displayed continuously when the

presentation is played (Avesalo, Figure 4 above timeline or see figure 5 below audio



and picture 1)

Claim 10 is similar in scope to that of claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to that of claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 14, Avesalo-Pavley teaches a telecommunications network including a plurality of telecommunications terminals at least one of which includes an apparatus according to claim 11 (Avesalo, [0018] communication network).

Claim 15 is similar in scope to that of claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale

As per claim 16, Avesalo-Pavley teaches a method as in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises receiving a signal from the user containing information that the user would like to prescribe one or more properties for an image being displayed in an edit mode (Avesalo, [0026]).

As per claim 17, Avesalo-Pavley teaches a method as in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises presenting the user with a dialog box in which the user is able to provide one or more properties for an image to be displayed, including to indicate the duration the image is to be displayed (Avesalo, [0024] adjust the time allocated and defining durations).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 12/28/2010, with respect to Claims 3,7,13 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 3,7,13,18-20 have been withdrawn.

Claims 3,7,13,18-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's arguments filed 12/28/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 1, the Applicant argues that Pavely fails to disclose presenting the user with a dialog box in which the user is able to provide a duration that the plurality of image objects of the slide that change is able to be displayed. While the Examiner understands what the Applicant is trying to convey through the claim language, which is a user manually entering a duration, the Pavely references reads on the claims' broadest reasonable interpretation. The user is presented with a dialog box and a user can provide a duration (3 secs) that the plurality of image objects of the slide is to be changed. The Examiner suggests adding language that conveys the custom or manually typing duration into the dialog box.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RYAN F. PITARO whose telephone number is

(571)272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on 571-272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ryan F Pitaro/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

